

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 17 to 21.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Final Rejection.

In this regard, the claims emphasize that the present method is directed to cathodic protection of steel reinforcement in concrete. This feature is emphasized by the title of the application and in previous claim 12.

New main claim 17 further recites that the claimed method employs a composition which contains graphite dispersed in a curable inorganic silicate binder, the support for which is evident from page 3, lines 1 and 2 of the specification and previous claim 9.

New claim 17 also recites a dispersing agent as previously recited in claim 9 and original claim 5.

Lastly, new claim 17 recites a gelling agent which reacts with said silicate binder to cause gelation thereof in pores of said concrete. Support is evident from, for example, page 4, first full paragraph.

New claims 18 to 20 depend on claim 17 and are based on previous claims 14 to 16.

New claim 21 is based on original claim 1 and the last full paragraph on page 6 of the specification.

The significance of this amendment will become further apparent from the remarks below.

Claims 9 to 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Wagner, Saunders or Gasmena.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Wagner teaches compositions for the protection of e.g. concrete against environmental influences but is not particularly concerned with cathodic protection of steel reinforcement in concrete. Therefore, carbon black and graphite are merely mentioned in column 3, line 42 as examples of various pigments since this reference is unconcerned with the conductivity of the composition.

Moreover, no mention is made of a gelling agent such as sodium aluminate or calcium hydroxide which reacts with a silicate binder to cause gelation thereof in the pores of the concrete being treated.

Accordingly, Wagner is completely unsuggestive of the present method as recited in claim 17 and is even less suggestive of the specific gelling agents, as recited in claim 18.

Saunders is concerned with conductive coatings to be applied, for example, to walls of buildings to provide electric heat. However, no specific mention is made of impregnation of the composition into the pores of concrete, with gelation in the pores of said concrete, especially to provide cathodic protection to the steel reinforcement in the concrete.

Gasmena is not specifically concerned with cathodic protection and it merely discloses a corrosion barrier which does not necessarily imply or suggest cathodic protection of steel reinforcement in the concrete. Nor is this reference concerned with gelation in the pores of the concrete to provide cathodic protection as presently recited.

For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that the rejections on prior art are untenable and should be withdrawn.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Franz PRUCKNER

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

By:   
Matthew M. Jacob  
Registration No. 25,154  
Attorney for Applicant

MJ/ke  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
September 20, 2004